

REMARKS

In reply to the Office Action of October 4, 2007, Applications have amended claims 1 and 6-8, and canceled claim 11. Accordingly, claims 1-10 and 12-13 are pending, with claim 1 in independent form.

The Examiner has objected to claims 6-8, alleging that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations " d_{50} " and " Q_0 ." The terms " d_{50} " and " Q_0 " are well-known terms of art, and would be commonly known to a person of skill in the art at the time of the invention. These terms are defined, for example, in International Standard ISO 9276-2, "Representation of results of particle-size analysis – part 2: Calculation of average particle sizes/diameters and moments from particle-size distributions." Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 6-8 to recite nanoparticles that have "an average particle diameter." The amendments to claims 6-8 are supported by the English translation of the originally-filed application at, for example, page 2, paragraph 4. The amendments to claims 6-8 render the objections to these claims moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 6-8 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-13 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Chen (U.S. Patent No. 5,962,971, "Chen") in view of Kambe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,099,798, "Kambe"). The Examiner alleges that Chen teaches all of the limitations of independent claim 1 except for a filter having a "plurality of nanoparticles," but relies on Kambe to teach such a filter, and alleges that it would have been obvious to a person of skill in the art to combine Chen and Kambe (see Action at pages 2-4).

Applicants do not concede the Examiner's position regarding the merits of combining Chen and Kambe. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to cover light-emitting components that include a "filter element comprising a plurality of nanoparticles embedded in a matrix material and having a dispersion-enhancing surface coating or a dispersion-enhancing surface modification." The amendment to claim 1 is supported, for example, by the subject matter of claim 11, and by the English translation of the

originally-filed application at page 7, last paragraph. In view of the amendment to claim 1, claim 11 has been canceled.

As amended, neither Chen nor Kambe, alone or in combination, discloses the light-emitting components covered by claim 1. The examiner has acknowledged that Chen fails to disclose nanoparticles embedded in a matrix material (Action at page 3). Further, although Kambe discusses "[n]anoscale UV absorbing particles" (Kambe, Abstract), he goes on to state that his particles "can be placed as a coating on [a] window or the particles can be dispersed within the window material" (Kambe, col. 11, lines 22-23). There is simply no disclosure in Kambe that relates to nanoparticles "having a dispersion-enhancing surface coating or a dispersion-enhancing surface modification," as required by amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Chen and Kambe, alone or in combination. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-10 and 12-13 depend from claim 1, and are patentable over both Chen and Kambe for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants ask that the application be allowed.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Any circumstance in which Applicants have: (a) addressed certain comments of the Examiner does not mean that Applicants concede other comments of the Examiner; (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims; or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that Applicants concede any of the Examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Enclosed is a check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing 12406-142US1.

Applicant : Bert Braune et al.
Serial No. : 10/564,071
Filed : June 19, 2006
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 12406-142US1 / P2003,0442
US N

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/7/08



Marc M. Wefers, Ph.D., J.D.
Reg. No. 56,842

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21867685.doc